

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

•••REMARKS/ARGUMENTS•••

The Official Action of December 26, 2008 has been thoroughly studied. Accordingly, the changes presented herein for the application, considered together with the following remarks, are believed to be sufficient to place the application into condition for allowance.

By the present amendment independent claim 1 has been changed to correct the general formula of  $\text{CH}_2=\text{CR}\text{COOR}'\text{Rf}$  (see original claim 1) and to recite that the polypropylene glycol-based compound has a molecular weight of 250-5,000.

Support for this change to independent claim 1 can be found in the third full paragraph on page 2 of applicants' specification.

Entry of the changes to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to claim 2. Under this objection the Examiner has noted that the amended claims submitted on February 22, 2007 do not show all the changes from the previous version of the claims submitted on October 4, 2006. The Examiner notes the word "and" was last deleted and now is added. The Examiner requested appropriate correction.

Claim 2 now is identified as being "Previously Presented" and includes the work "and" without underlining.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Under this rejection the Examiner has stated that "[t]he instant specification....does not disclose the "colloid mill" or "an ultrasonic dispersing apparatus."

The Examiner has further stated that: "the phrase "the monomer mixture is emulsified and disperses" is not disclosed in the instant specification."

In paragraph [0016] applicants' specification discloses:

Copolymer can be produced by an emulsion polymerization process. In the emulsion polymerization process, the individual monomers are **emulsion dispersed** into an aqueous medium by various surfactants, preferably a non-ionic surfactant, a cationic surfactant, or a mixture thereof, and polymerization reaction is carried out at about 65° to about 75°C. in the presence of a radical initiator such as 2,2'-azobis(2-aminopropane).dihydrochloride, azobisisobutylamidine .hydrochloride, etc. Before the emulsion polymerization reaction, the monomer mixture can be emulsion dispersed into the aqueous medium by a powerful emulsification means such as a **high pressure homogenizer, a colloid mill, an ultrasonic wave dispersing apparatus, etc.**

It is believed that this disclosure satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for the "colloid mill," "ultrasonic dispensing apparatus," and the process in which the "monomer mixture is emulsified and dispersed."

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,876,617 to Sato et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,055,538 to Amimoto et al.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

For the reasons set forth below, it is submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record and therefore, the outstanding prior art rejection of the claims should properly be withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration by the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner has relied upon Sato et al, as disclosing:

...a method for producing an acrylic copolymer (Abstract, C2/L8-23), which comprises emulsion polymerizing a monomer mixture of (a) 30-70% by weight of perfluoroalkylalkyl (meth)acrylate (Abstract, C2/L9-16), represented by the following general formula:



(where R is a hydrogen atom of a methyl group, R' is a linear or branched alkylene group having 1-8 carbon atoms, and Rf is a perfluoroalkyl group having 4-16 carbon atoms) (Abstract, C2/L9-16), (b) 25-60% by weight of stearyl (meth)acrylate (Abstract, C2/L16-17), and (d) 0.1-5% by weight of N-methylol (meth)acrylamide (Abstract, C2/L8-23) in the presence of a non-ionic and/or cationic surfactant (C3/L9-22) wherein a polypropylene glycol-based compound is used as an emulsification aid (C3/L5-8).

The Examiner concedes that:

Sato et al. discloses not more than 5% by weight of hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate (C2/L20-23). However, Sato et al. does not disclose 0.1-5% by weight of (meth)acrylamide.

The Examiner has accordingly relied upon Amimoto et al. as teaching:

...a method for producing an acrylic copolymer (C6/L19-68, Table 4). Amimoto et al. further teaches hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate is equivalent to (meth)acrylamide, since both compounds have similar functions, which is to increase water-and-oil-repellency and durability of the water- and oil-repellent (C3/L27-60, C3/L67-C4/L5).

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

In combining the teachings of Sato et al. and Amimoto et al. the Examiner takes the position that:

...it would have been obvious....to substitute the (meth)acrylamide for the hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate of method of Sato et al., since substitution of equivalent water- and oil-repellency agents requires no express motivation, as long as the prior art recognizes the equivalency.

It is noted that Sato et al. claims priority to Japanese application No. 9-60132 which corresponds to Japanese application publication No. 10-237133 which is cited and discussed on page 1 of applicants' specification. As discussed, problems associated with Sato et al. include problems with mechanical emulsificability and polymerization stability, and the resulting emulsion fails to fully satisfy the emulsion stability, preservation stability and further washing stability when used as a water and oil repellent. (See applicants' paragraph [0002])

Applicants' invention is presented as addressing and overcoming the problems noted with Sato et al.

An acrylic copolymer according to the present invention is prepared from the following monomers:

- (a) perfluoroalkylalkyl (meth)acrylate
- (b) stearyl (meth)acrylate
- (c) (meth)acrylamide
- (d) N-methylol (meth)acrylamide
- (e) optionally, hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

A polypropylene glycol-based compound having a molecular weight of 250-5,000 is used as an emulsification aid together with a non-ionic and/or cationic surfactant for emulsion polymerization.

In the case of using a polypropylene glycol-based compound as an emulsification aid, the emulsion stability of the aqueous dispersion, given by percent weight precipitates and 10%, 50% and 90% particle sizes are improved as discussed in applicants' paragraph [0019].

As noted above, Sato et al. has the same problems that are discussed in applicants' paragraph [0002].

In this regard, Sato et al. teaches a copolymer that is prepared from the following monomers:

- (a) perfluoroalkylalkyl (meth)acrylate (FAAC, etc.)
- (b) stearyl (meth)acrylate (STAC, etc.)
- (c) 2-chloroethyl vinyl ether (CEVE)
- (d) N-methylol (meth)acrylamide (NMAM, etc.)
- (e) optionally, hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate (HAMA, etc.)

A copolymer of FAAC/STAC/CEVE/AM/HEMA is found in Examples 1-6 of Sato et al.

In order to distinguish their invention over Sato et al. and establish improved properties and characteristics over Sato et al., applicants have included Comparative Example 1 using FAAC/STAC/CEVE/AM/HEMA, in which AM (acrylamide) is used in place of CEVE.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

As shown by the test results found in applicants' Table on page 15 of their specification, the Comparative Example 1 which corresponds to the teachings of Sato et al. shows no improvements in water repellency, oil repellency and all of the aqueous dispersion properties.

Although the Examiner has taken the position that "it would have been obvious....to substitute the (meth)acrylamide for the hydroxyalkyl of method of Sato et al.," the differences between the present invention and Sato et al. have been demonstrated by the results of using AM and CEVE.

These differences are unexpected over the teachings of Sato et al.

Therefore, applicants' claimed invention is not obvious over the teachings of Sato et al. or the combination of Sato et al. and Amimoto et al.

Moreover, these results contradict the Examiner's position that hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate is equivalent to (meth)acrylamide in the scope of applicants' invention and Sato et al.

Amimoto et al. teaches a copolymer which is prepared from the following monomers:

- (a) perfluoroalkylalkyl (meth)acrylate
- (b) stearyl (meth)acrylate
- (c) alkyl (meth)acrylate having C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>8</sub> alkyl group
- (d) N-methylol (meth)acrylate
- (e) hydroxyalkyl (meth)acrylate
- (f) optionally, (meth)acrylamide.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

In Amimoto et al. 5-50% by weight and preferably 5-25% by weight of alkyl (meth)acrylate having C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>8</sub> alkyl group is used as an essential comonomer.

Sato et al. and Amimoto et al. are distinguishable over the present invention in that (meth)acrylate is not used as a comonomer in these references.

When using a copolymer which is not copolymerized by (meth)acrylate, the monomer emulsificability will become poor, resulting in a lower water- and oil-repellency and poor emulsion preservation stability.

Rather than the monomer composition for copolymerization, the present invention uses a polypropylene glycol-based compound having a molecular weight of 250-5,000 as an emulsification aid with non-ionic and/or cationic surfactants for emulsion polymerization.

Neither Sato et al. nor Amimoto et al. teach or suggest the use of a polypropylene glycol-based compound having a molecular weight of 250-5,000 as an emulsification aid through or in the combined use with these surfactants for emulsion polymerization.

See Sato et al. at column 3, lines 18-19 and Amimoto et al. at column 4, lines 33-35.

Although the Examiner has relied upon Sato et al. at column 3, lines 5-8 as teaching "a polypropylene glycol-based compound is used as an emulsification aid," this portion of Sato et al. discusses the use of a hydrophilic monomer that is used to facilitate emulsion dispensability and not an emulsification aid, and not a polypropylene glycol-based compound having a molecular weight of 250-5,000.

Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

Moreover, column 3, lines 5-8 of Sato et al. does not teach the use of polypropylene glycol-based compound in conjunction or combination with surfactants as an emulsification aid.

As discussed in applicants' paragraph [0019] the molecular weight of the polypropylene glycol-based compound has a direct effect on the emulsion stability which will be lower outside of either end of applicants' claimed molecular weight range.

Based upon the above distinctions between the prior art relied upon by the Examiner and the present invention, and the overall teachings of prior art, properly considered as a whole, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner cannot rely upon the prior art as required under 35 U.S.C. §103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of applicants' claimed invention.

It is, therefore, submitted that any reliance upon prior art would be improper inasmuch as the prior art does not remotely anticipate, teach, suggest or render obvious the present invention.

It is submitted that the claims, as now amended, and the discussion contained herein clearly show that the claimed invention is novel and neither anticipated nor obvious over the teachings of the prior art and the outstanding rejections of the claims should hence be withdrawn.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of the claims and an early allowance of the claims is believed to be in order.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Official Action and reconsideration is requested.




Appl. No. 10/587,640  
Amdt. Dated June 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 26, 2008

If upon consideration of the above, the Examiner should feel that there remain outstanding issues in the present application that could be resolved; the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' patent counsel at the telephone number given below to discuss such issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 12-2136 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael S. Gzybowski  
Reg. No. 32,816

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
524 South Main Street  
Suite 200  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104  
(734) 302-6000